

From: [Sheila St. John](#)
To: [E-OHPSCA2713.EBSA](#)
Subject: mandated free contraceptive coverage
Date: Saturday, September 17, 2011 4:47:24 PM
Attachments: [image001.gif](#)

In my lifetime, I do not know if I will need many of the features of my insurance coverage. I cannot anticipate, or control for the most part, if I during my life I will suffer a disease process such as heart disease, diabetes, or cancer, for which I might need covered treatments or medications. But I am relieved to know they are available, to me and to others, and I would desire such coverage in any policy I obtain.

However, I can say that I have never needed nor desired, a prescription or surgical procedure to prevent pregnancy. And unlike disease processes I cannot predict, I could also have confidently predicted forty years ago I would never need insurance coverage for contraception, since planning my family did not require any medical intervention, but simply becoming knowledgeable in my body, and trained in use of natural methods of family planning. I understand some will choose the alternative path of suppressing their normal reproductive function through the use of surgical procedures and prescription medications. I do not understand why this totally optional alternative is elevated to the unique status of being provided free of charge to those who choose it, while those of who have no need of it because we plan our families without these interventions, or are ethically opposed to such treatments, must subsidize this choice.

I do not oppose my insurance premiums subsidizing the care of disease processes, or the prevention of disease process (even, I might add, if those disease processes such as breast cancer or blood clots or heart disease were exacerbated by the use of prescribed oral contraceptives), but pregnancy is not a disease.

Sheila St. John
Executive Director
California Association of Natural Family Planning
www.canfp.org
1-877-33-CANFP